



King County

Citizens' Advisory Commission on Homeless Encampments

Meeting Summary August 2, 2004

Commissioners Present: Rhonda Berry, Capt. Carl Cole, Shane Davies, Dini Duclos, Bill Hobson, Bill Kirlin-Hackett, Sandra Kortum, Chaplain Al Patterson, Alan Painter, Holly Plackett, Steven Pyeatt, Susan Rynas, Bob Santos, Judy Schnebele, Ron Swicord, Robert Thompson MD, Rev. Harriett Walden, Linda Weedman, Janna Wilson

Commissioners Absent: Paul Fischburg, Tony Lee, Doug Stevenson

Guests: Carol Cameron, Rebecca Campbell, Susie Davies, Anitra Freeman, Diana James, Rudy Al James, Kevin Kelly, Michele Marchand, Norman Milliard, Scott Morrow, Leo Rhodes, Karen Young

Staff Present: John Briggs, Sherry Hamilton, Jackie MacLean, Jeff Muhm, Kate Speltz, Patrick Vanzo, David Wertheimer

Facilitator David Wertheimer welcomed commissioners and guests. Commissioners introduced themselves, and guests introduced themselves and their affiliation.

Meeting summaries from the July 27, 2004 and July 29, 2004 meetings were approved as written.

Development of recommended policy and procedural guidelines for determining the location of future homeless encampments.

Facilitator Wertheimer noted that this was the last discussion meeting before the draft report was to be written. He proposed a round robin sharing of Commissioner recommendations to develop policy and procedural guidelines, stressing that their charge was to recommend policies regarding the location of future encampments only, and not governance or other issues. A question was raised as to why information and presentations on SHARE Tent Cities and their governance had been presented to the CACHE if those issues weren't to be included in the recommendations. Wertheimer responded that the information had been included as part of the background on tent cities in our area in order to educate commissioners about the issue.

Commissioner Swicord suggested that the CACHE start its discussion with the City of Seattle's tent city policies to determine what might be a fit for the CACHE recommendations. Seattle's policies are briefly noted in an August 2, 2004 document called *CACHE Questions: Responses to questions received the week of July 26*; and included more fully in the back section of the commissioners' CACHE binders.

This suggestion was accepted and Commissioner Painter was asked to go over the conditions that the City of Seattle uses. Before beginning, Painter noted that these conditions were the result of the City of Seattle's negotiations with SHARE/WHEEL and in the case of Seattle, an agreement with SHARE/WHEEL only. It was determined that, for CACHE purposes, the policies will not be SHARE/WHEEL exclusive, but rather applicable to any "sponsoring organization".

Each of the City of Seattle tent city policies were read, discussed and re-articulated for county purposes. Wertheimer wrote them up, and once the entire list was finished, the group voted on each of the recommended policies. As the county policies are focused on the location of encampments, a number of the Seattle policies were excluded from the county list as outside the CACHE purview.

1. Sponsoring organization must secure agreement in writing with the host property owner.

VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

2. Promptly notify the appropriate local government department(s) responsible for land use of the agreement, including cities containing or contiguous to encampment sites.

VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

3. Notify the community of:

- Date encampment will begin
- Length of encampment
- Number of residents
- Host location (location of encampment)
- Date(s), time(s), and location(s) of community meeting(s)

VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

- 3a. Timing of community notification (number of days prior to start of encampment):

5-14 days: 4 yes

14-30 days: 7 yes

30 days: 3 yes

Discussion: if an encampment were allowed to stay in a given place for a longer period of time, then a longer community notification period might be reasonable.

- 3b. Size of area to be notified (in proximity to site of encampment):

Two (2) blocks: 8 yes

1,320 feet / 1/4 mile: 6 yes

Discussion: Less dense population and structures in suburban and most unincorporated areas may suggest the need for a larger notification area. The size of the notification area must be balanced with the cost-burden of notification.

4. Conduct one to two community meetings to explain the proposal and respond to questions.

VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

Discussion: For smaller communities, one meeting may be adequate given the population and appropriate use of staff time and resources; other larger communities may want a second meeting as an option.

5. Comply with maximum number of residents.

Maximum of 100 persons: 9 yes

Maximum of 75 persons: 6 yes

6. Provide buffers from surrounding properties as specified in the agreement.

VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

6a. Provide additional buffers with regards to proximity to schools, day care facilities, etc.

VOTE: 3 yes / 12 no

Discussion: Some commissioners noted that the greatest concern of people they heard from was the safety of children and that additional buffers would help to address that concern; other commissioners expressed strong disagreement with taking any position that appears to endorse the perspective that homelessness correlates with being a threat to children.

7. Consider impacts to on- and off-site parking. VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

8. Consider health and environmental impact of location including meeting health, safety, transportation and human service needs of residents.

VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

[Note: This recommended policy was submitted by Commissioner Janna Wilson, representing Public Health-Seattle & King County. She recommended that encampment location selection must take into consideration specific public health and safety directives, as well as proximity to the human service and transportation needs of encampment residents.

9. Duration of stay must be compatible with climate-related location limitations.

VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

10. Duration of encampment at any one location is not to exceed three consecutive months, and not to exceed six months in any two-year period.

VOTE: 13 yes / 2 no

Exception can be made if the impact on the surrounding community is negligible, the site is suitable and/or the community is supportive.

Discussion: Commissioners sought to balance the stability needs of those in the encampments (including accessing employment opportunities) with concerns about the impact of encampments on the property values of nearby homeowners.

Once the Seattle policies were reviewed, commissioners proposed a few additional policies.

Proposed by Commissioner Swicord:

11. Sponsoring agency to carry a \$2 million performance bond. VOTE: 3 yes / 12 no

12. Sponsoring Agency to carry a \$2 million liability insurance policy. VOTE: 3 yes / 12 no

13. Residents of and visitors to encampments shall hold King County harmless from liabilities related to encampments. VOTE: 15 yes / 0 no

Note: #12 and #13 were initially offered as a single policy, but separated at the request of other commissioners

14. A special permitting review board with a recommended composition of of three (3) King County Council members, three (3) local electeds from area(s) affected by encampments, and three (3) citizens from affected areas appointed by electeds be established to review and grant permits for homeless encampments. VOTE: 4 yes / 10 no / 1 abstention

Proposed by Commissioner Pyeatt:

15. Consequences for violations of terms be established, up to and including closing down a given encampment. This proposed policy was not voted on as it was determined not to be a location al in nature.

Proposed by Commissioner Davies:

16. King County identify and specify King County parcels that could potentially be used for homeless encampments. VOTE: 11 yes / 3 no [note: Commissioner Duclos left prior to this vote, so the total number of votes is one less that the previous 15 policies]

Sunset Clause – The Commission agreed to revisit the question of how long King County should continue to provide for homeless encampments (before they are no longer needed) at the August 9 meeting. Discussion: A two-year timeframe for phasing out the need for encampments gives a strong sense of the urgency of the issue, but may not be realistic given funding cycles.

A discussion took place on the number of the encampments per sponsoring organization but no vote was taken.

Additional Voting: Commissioners who have been absent and have missed the opportunity to vote will be invited to add their positions to the final tally at the August 9 meeting. It would be ideal for the report to include 18 votes (the full number possible) for each of the decision areas.

Discussion of CACHE Report outline / Next steps

Wertheimer presented a Draft CACHE Final Report Outline. The intent is to have one single report (i.e.: no "minority report"), with majority and minority positions documented along with actual vote numbers and rationales cited. Differences in positions will be clearly articulated within each of the decision areas.

The structure as presented was approved, with the following changes / additions:

Part I: Bullet 2 reworded to say: Encampments are one piece of evidence of the failure of King County and its communities to adequately address and end the problem of homelessness.

Part II: Commissioners want to note their disappointment at the lack of response/input by city managers and elected officials.

Discussion: The message is urgency.

Timeframe: Draft report will be sent electronically to Commissioners by end of day Friday, August 6, 2004 for review by commissioners prior to the final scheduled CACHE meeting on Monday, August 9, 2004.

Final report is due to Jackie MacLean by Thursday, August 12, 2004 for submission to the King County Council on Friday, August 13, 2004.

The meeting adjourned